

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 17

MAY 2, 1960



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Another "Little Band of Wilful Men"

Forty years ago at the end of World War I the Senate blocked the peace treaty which would have put the United States into the League of Nations, and thereby destroyed one hope of avoiding World War II. Today another "little band of wilful men", in Woodrow Wilson's bitter phrase, is preparing to block the two-thirds vote required for a nuclear test agreement, and thereby destroy one hope of avoiding World War III. This is the perspective in which to see the four days of hearings with which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has just spread pessimism about the feasibility of a test agreement.

The League of Nations was not defeated by open opposition. Only a dozen Senators dared oppose the League openly. The League was defeated by spreading confusion and disquiet, by advocating so many additional safeguards, by loading the treaty with so many reservations that Wilson would have had the impossible task of renegotiating the Covenant if the multiply amended Treaty *had* been ratified. The same strategy is being pursued today by the enemies of peace. Their Thermopylae is the Joint Committee. They claim only to want a fool-proof treaty. But for them this means 100 percent assurance not only against the known realities but against any and every lunatic possibility of concealment dreamed up by Mad Hatter scientists like Dr. Teller, and amplified by such incendiary idiots as Hosmer of California on the Joint Committee.

The Sinister Uses of May Day Parades

We offer a sample, the prize exhibit of the hearings. Dr. C. E. Violet of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory was on the stand, and talk turned to the "big hole" theory of concealment with which Dr. Teller has bedevilled the negotiations. "Assuming," Congressman Hosmer asked, "that you could drill this hole from the inside of a building or something from the middle of town, and blow this thing off in the middle of a May Day parade, you would not have much chance at all of any visible manifestation of any kind would you?" to which Dr. Violet replied accommodatingly, "That is correct, if you build a strong enough building." The Russians, when they read these hearings, must think us *whacky*.

The Same, Careful Objective Manner?

"These hearings," Senator Anderson, chairman of the Joint Committee said in announcing them, "will be conducted in the same careful objective manner as the hearings held by Congressman Chet Holifield on The Nature of Radioactive Fallout and Its Effects on Man." Since Anderson was highly dissatisfied with those hearings last year and stayed away from these new ones, one wonders whether he wrote this testimonial tongue-in-cheek. The pattern was the same. It was to give

5 ★

Gallant Concession

"I should, however, like to make one point quite explicit. If you want to be optimistic, and if you want to believe that methods of detection can be worked out so that tests can be really controlled and checked and policed, I dare not say that this is impossible. Very few things in science are impossible."

—Dr. Edward Teller, Holifield Hearings, March 20.

most of the limelight to those who speak for the AEC point of view, relegating critics to panels in which few have a chance to express themselves fully, and the AEC crowd has a second chance at bat. The hearings were one-sided in three respects. The first was in division of time. The four days of hearings filled 677 pages of transcript but only 65 pages, or less than 10 percent, can be reckoned as giving voice to critics of Dr. Teller and proponents of a treaty. Even this is an overstatement since it includes the 35 pages of the one panel discussion the morning of the third day, and 7 pages of these 35 were filled by Dr. Teller—after saying, "I am a little hesitant to talk!" The first two days of the hearings the Committee heard eight witnesses including Dr. Teller, all of them on the negative side except the last, Dr. Hans Bethe. He did not take the stand until almost 4:30 p.m. of the second day and only Holifield as chairman stayed to hear him. Of the 352 pages of testimony the first two days, Dr. Bethe's filled only the final 25 or about 7 percent of the total. The only other time Dr. Bethe and his supporters had a chance to be heard was on the panel discussion the third morning and even here they were outnumbered, and out-talked. Of 11 scientists on the panel, only four were supporters of Dr. Bethe and only one, Dr. Richard Roberts of Carnegie Institution, had a chance really to expound his point of view (see box, page 2).

An Earlier Test Ban Would Have Helped Us

The hearings were also rigged by their frame of reference. Holifield insisted from the outset that discussion be limited to technical questions of detection and concealment, though—characteristically—this was not applied to Dr. Teller who was allowed to argue his familiar theme: the need for cleaner, more flexible and discriminating tactical weapons. Dr. Bethe did not have a chance to say to the Committee what he did last Monday night in a speech to the Washington Philosophical Society. Dr. Bethe said (1) we already had tactical weapons in many sizes, shapes and weights down to fractions of one kiloton and (2) that if testing resumes the Russians were more likely to concentrate on catching up to us in those large strategic thermonuclear weapons that threaten our homeland.

(Continued on Page Two)

(Continued from Page One)

"It may be hard to judge the future," Dr. Bethe said in that speech, "but it is easy to judge the past. In 1955 the Russians wanted to stop testing in 1956. They only had one H-bomb then; we had half a dozen. If we had accepted their offer to stop testing then, they would not have ICBM warheads and we would not need to fear the missile gap."

The Hobgoblin of Cheating

By limiting the discussion to the technicalities of detection, the Joint Committee made it impossible to weigh the risks of a continued arms race against the risks of cheating. Cheating itself was treated as a technological question. This, under the circumstances of these hearings, produced prefabricated alarmist headlines since no inspection system can be foolproof and there is no way to disprove the negative proposition that a violator *might* succeed in eluding surveillance. Dr. Bethe pointed out in his Monday night speech that if the Russians were as anxious to develop small tactical weapons as the Tellerites imply, they could do so with much less effort and with no risk of being branded as a treaty-violator by accepting our proposal to ban tests only above the 20 kiloton level. No one dared argue before the Joint Committee that it would be absurd for the suspicious Russians to pay the price of allowing foreign installations and inspectors on their soil and *then* risk cheating. Nor could anyone mention that we and the Russians had a common interest in slowing down the arms race and the spread of nuclear weapons, an interest far outweighing anything which could be gained by secret testing. The most striking omission was any testimony on the feasibility of shielding from normal intelligence operations the enormous excavation jobs lasting two to three years for the "big holes" and the problem of how to hide the year long pumping operations required to empty the huge amounts of brine which must be flushed from salt domes if they are to be used for secret tests. Such operations are easily spotted, as CIA sources have admitted to private Congressional inquiry.

The hearings were rigged in another respect, and this was by the obvious preconceptions of the Joint Committee members. Senators Gore, Pastore and Hickenlooper, Congressmen Holifield, Price and Hosmer, have all been won over to the anti-test cessation point of view by the AEC. The searching critical kind of questions with which Senator Anderson on past occasions has pricked the propaganda balloons of the AEC was nowhere in evidence at these hearings. Indeed scientists were frightened off from testifying by word that Dr. Bethe had been subjected to rough questioning in an executive session several weeks ago for sending the *New York Times* a letter in which he called the Russian compromise proposal "a major step forward." Dr. Bethe was accused of having reached this judgment before seeing the text of the Soviet proposal though Chairman Anderson of the Joint Committee and Chairman McCone of the AEC had leaped into print to attack the offer without waiting either. Apparently the privilege of jumping to conclusions is limited to those who favor testing.

The preconceptions of the Committee were evident in the double standard it applied to the race between the means of detection and the means of concealment. It tended to dismiss suggestions for improved detection, no matter how well based, as purely theoretical but it treated ideas for better concealment, no matter how conjectural, as if they were fully proven and

Not A Difficult Problem

Dr. Richard B. Roberts, geophysicist with the Carnegie Institution, vice chairman of the science and technology panel of the Democratic Advisory Council, told the Holifield hearings (1) that "for the last five years at least we have known that seismic detection would be an important element in the nuclear test ban but there has not been a corresponding acceleration in the work," (2) it was "a sad commentary on the amount of work" being done on seismology in this country that "about 40 percent of the data available comes from two men working half-time" at the Carnegie Institution and (3) that the problem of distinguishing nuclear explosions from earthquakes "looks very promising" compared to other problems he has worked on "which at the outset looked almost impossible, like the proximity fuse." The 17-man panel, which includes three Nobel prize winners, issued a statement two days after the Holifield hearings closed, strongly reiterating support for a test ban agreement, deploring inadequate research in seismic detection and urging the government to commission a high priority study in the field.

attained realities. The result has been to put pressure on advocates of a treaty to act as if the Russians really were going to build huge Rockefeller Centres underground all over the Soviet Union for clandestine nuclear detonations. The original network agreed on in Geneva two years ago called for 21 "listening posts" in the Soviet Union. Richard Latter of the Rand Corporation testified that with 30 stations the system could be made as effective as that envisaged in 1958, that is down to the 5 kiloton threshold. But this would not take care of Dr. Teller's "big holes." To meet this argument, Dr. Roberts of the Carnegie Institute suggested a 400-km network of 125 stations and Dr. Bethe a 200-km network of 600 unmanned stations. These could detect even 20 kiloton explosions decoupled by a factor of 300 or 1/15th of a kiloton.

Detection Stations Every Ten Feet?

This made headlines, but it was intended, Dr. Bethe later explained, as a purely theoretical computation. Actually the seismic areas of the Soviet Union in which an explosion might be mistaken for an earthquake and the areas in which there are underground salt domes in which nuclear blasts could be muffled are limited.* So he estimated after his Monday night talk that fewer than 300 unmanned stations would seem to be ample to safeguard against a maximum amount of muffling, though as Dr. Harold Brown of Lawrence Radiation Laboratory said ironically at one point during the hearings, "One can have people at stations ten feet apart and one could get the threshold down very low." The problem will soon be moving out Russians to make room for more inspectors.

"I have discussed all this quite seriously," Dr. Bethe told the Philosophical Society after outlining his plan for unmanned stations every 125 miles across the Soviet Union, "but I think we're all behaving like a bunch of lunatics to take this big hole seriously."

*Dr. Richard Latter testified that about 90 percent of the earthquakes in the Soviet Union occur in about five percent of its total area. Dr. Bethe said that as to salt domes in which to muffle tests "we once had an estimate which was that it was quite a lot less than one percent of the Soviet Union which would be eligible for such excavations."

Signs In and Out of Congress That Witch Hunt Politics Are On The Decline

Roosevelt Offers Leadership in Fight to End Un-American Committee

There were signs within the past week that the time is coming when it may be possible to get rid of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Republican primary in New Jersey April 19 was one of them. It demonstrated that witch hunt politics no longer paid off. Robert Morris, counsel of the Senate Internal Security Committee in its attack on the Institute of Pacific Relations and Owen Lattimore was badly defeated despite big moneyed support in his effort to take the Republican Senatorial nomination from the incumbent, Case, one of the few liberals in the GOP.

That same day, in the House of Representatives, Mrs. Edith Green (D. Ore), one of the spunkiest progressives in Congress, led off a debate on "freedom of religion", by which she meant freedom from the kind of scurrilous attack made on the National Council of Churches by the Air Force Manual, and by the crackpot elements which find a sounding board in the House Un-American Activities Committee. Fourteen members rose to support Mrs. Green and four others were given permission to do so in extension of remarks.*

A Feeble Smear The Only Reply

Mrs. Green and her colleagues filled 36 pages of the Congressional Record with a documented defense of the National Council and an exposé of its critics. There was no answer from Walter and his supporters but next day Jackson of California, one of the wooliest members of the Un-American Activities Committee, delivered a fresh attack on the Council,

*The fourteen were Ullman (Ore), Reuss (Wis), Clem Miller (Cal) Hechler (W. Va.), Meyer (Vt), Kastenmeier (Wis), Johnson (Col), O'Hara (Mich) Brademas (Ind), Udall (Ariz), Wright (Tex), Cohelan (Cal), Barr (Col) and Schwengel (Iowa). The four were Wolf (Iowa), Quigley (Penn), Karth (Minn) and Lindsay (NY), all but last named are Democrats.

Court to Hear Braden

The Supreme Court last Monday agreed to hear the appeal of Carl Braden from a conviction for contempt of the House Un-American Activities Committee and set it down for argument with the companion case of Frank Wilkinson. "I believe," Mr. Braden said, "that the Supreme Court will uphold the right of a citizen to work for integration without being constantly harassed by the segregationists who control the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee."

claiming that of 240 books recommended by it on a reading list about the Negro problem some were "obscene". Mrs. Green challenged Jackson to name them but he said they were too "improper" for insertion in the Congressional Record. The only book he mentioned was Bucklin Moon's "Without Magnolias," and Mrs. Green thereupon produced a letter from the Postoffice Dept. rebutting Jackson's charge that it has been declared unmailable as obscene.

Then last Monday Congressman James Roosevelt of California delivered a major speech (see excerpts in box below) calling for the abolition of the House Committee and exposing its high-handed, irresponsible and cruel treatment of teachers in California. Mr. Roosevelt began with an apology for having spoken "too obliquely" on the subject last year and giving Chairman Walter "a colorable reason for thinking I had no criticism of the Committee itself." This year there could be no mistake about Mr. Roosevelt's intention. We suggest that special "abolition" committees in every Congressional district circulate his speech and ask all candidates whether they will vote to abolish the committee when the new Congress meets in January.

From Roosevelt's Historic Speech Calling for Abolition of the Un-American Committee

"The Committee indicts itself by its very conduct . . . First of all, it spends large amounts of needed time, energy and money in ponderously investigating and restating the obvious . . . Second, it combines with this a contrasting inability to understand the very real complexities of human behavior . . . Its world is one of black and white . . . Third, as the Air Force Manual controversy illustrates, the Committee has repeatedly shown its inability to stick to its own business . . . Fourth, the Committee has no real usefulness . . . The various police and counter-espionage agencies do what the Committee merely claims to do . . .

"Fifth, despite the existence of the police . . . the Committee has undertaken to constitute itself as a roving police and prosecution agency . . . Sixth, the Committee also acts as a Court . . . yet it is not subject to the restraints . . . we impose upon our judiciary.

"Seventh, the mandate which we did in fact give the Committee is itself defective and inherently contrary to our democratic traditions. How did we come to establish a Committee to decide what was 'un-American,' and still worse how did we persuade ourselves that propaganda, speech, was a fit subject for regulation by inquisitorial techniques such as the Committee employs? To me, the very nature of that commission is at war with our profoundest principles, and it cannot help but be executed in a manner destructive of those principles. We have, in effect, created an agency to supervise the exercise of

First Amendment rights, an organ for censorship and suppression.

"Finally, then, we come to what I think is the most serious criticism of the Committee, the fact that it has become an agency for the destruction of human dignity and constitutional rights . . . Endlessly they are dragooned before the Committee and accused. Secret sources, arrogance, rudeness, maximized defamation, and the threat of prosecution either for perjury or contempt if they do not seek the refuge of silence are the constant ingredients of this degrading spectacle. Beyond this, the Committee is sanctimoniously cruel. Those who would answer the charges against themselves are forced to accuse others and become the agents of further havoc . . .

"Mr. Speaker, fellow members of the House, it is, I think, a monstrous thing that we have created such an institution and lent it our powers and prestige. But we can also end this terrible agency and take back our powers . . .

"I urge the rest of my colleagues to give this matter serious thought and to speak of it when they return to their constituencies this summer. I think we need only break that spell of anxiety to find wide support for the abolition of this thoroughly bad institution. Then those who return here next January can complete this imperative task which is the business of this House alone. We would then be acting in the service of our best traditions. Let us set our House aright."

—Rep. James Roosevelt (D. Cal.) in the House April 25.

De Gaulle's Glamorous Visit Should Not Blind Us to His Failure in Algeria

Rhee's Fall A Warning: All the World's Divided Countries Are Time Bombs

If there were daring statesmanship in Washington, Moscow would now be challenged to stabilize the world East and West by agreeing to internationally supervised free elections in all divided countries: Germany, Korea, and Vietnam including a plebiscite on Formosa; appended to this a proposal to demilitarize these in-between areas as permanent "zones of peace" free from big power rivalry. The U.S. has been for free elections in Germany but not in Korea and Vietnam; Moscow has been for free elections in Korea and Vietnam but not in Germany. Each side favors free elections where it expects to win the outcome, and each side has its rationalizations for continued division. But each of these divided countries is a sputtering fuse that can set off civil and international war at any time. How firmly in power Rhee appeared to be a few months ago! How solid the Ulbricht regime appears to be today! How quickly in these dictatorships determined demonstrators can bring down the facade of order! The danger is not the reunification of Germany—on the contrary a divided Germany will breed new nationalist poisons in the susceptible German people—but its remilitarization. A united Germany in a zone of peace without arms could still mobilize the enthusiasm of enough ordinary Germans to make this a viable solution.

If Rhee Had Nuclear Weapons

There is a second lesson in Korean events. Note that Rhee's Ambassador was not invited to sit in Tuesday afternoon (just before Rhee's resignation) at the meeting in the State Department of the nations which take part in the Korean UN command. What the U.S. and its allies feared, what they felt had better be discussed without the presence of Rhee's envoy, was the possibility that he might try to unleash war against North Korea to save his regime. This has been the anxiety of U.S. military forces for many months, safeguarded against by strictly rationing Rhee's supplies. But let us move the clock ahead ten years when the spread of nuclear weapons has put them in the hands of these smaller countries. What if Rhee had nuclear arms with which he could swiftly precipitate a holocaust? Imagine a world in which there were nuclear arms

Hat's Off to The New York Times

We take our hat off to the New York Times for speaking out in its best tradition April 21 for the release of Dr. Willard Uphaus, still in jail in New Hampshire, and for its editorial the same day protesting the Niukkanen deportation. The Washington Post April 23 joined the New York Times in calling attention to the cruelty of this case. A 51-year-old Portland, Oregon, house-painter who came to this country from Finland when one year old, Niukkanen is married to an American and served honorably in the Army. The Supreme Court 5-to-5 upheld his deportation under the 1950 McCarran Internal Security Act for past membership in the Communist party. Niukkanen was a member from 1937 to 1939. Both newspapers called for amendment of the law to repeal the past membership provision. Won't some Congressman introduce a special bill now allowing Niukkanen to stay?

in the hands of the desperate men of South Africa, fearing black Africa; or the French military men in Algeria, fearing a fresh invasion of rebels from Tunisia; or Chiang Kai-shek, menaced by street mobs in Formosa as Rhee was in Seoul. Here we can see the clock ticking away.

The glamorous visit of de Gaulle and the deserved tributes paid him should not shut our eyes to the realities. De Gaulle is a great and eloquent man; a man to whom lofty utterance comes as second nature; a man incapable of the banal or pedestrian; a man of insight but still a prisoner. A prisoner, first of his own nationalism, which has led him to pluck the poisoned fruit of nuclear weapons knowledge; a prisoner, secondly, of the shabby conspirators, malcontents, dead-end military men and Fascists who brought him to power. De Gaulle's assets of Arab good will are dwindling; his regime is bogged down in the old *immobilisme* on the key question of Algeria: this will decide whether France is to remain free or face a Fascist challenge in the streets; and this is an international problem because if Chinese Communist volunteers appear in the Algerian war, the repercussions will draw us in.

If You Send A Stamped Self-Addressed Long Envelope, We'll Send A Free Copy of This Week's to A Friend

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:*

Name

Street

City Zone..... State.....

5/2/60

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone..... State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone, Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.